

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/810,774 03/26/2004		Timofei Nikita Kroupenkine	24-15-8	9674		
7:	7590 03/28/2006			EXAMINER		
Lucent Technologies Inc.			FOOTLAND, LENARD A			
Docket Admini	strator - Room 3J-219					
101 Crawfords Corner Road			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
Holmdel NI	07733_3030	3693				

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary			Application No.	plication No. Applicant(s)					
		10/810,774	KROUPENKINE	KROUPENKINE ET AL.					
		Examiner	Art Unit						
			Lenard A. Footland	3682					
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE M nsions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comn o period for reply is specified above, the maximum st re to reply within the set or extended period for reply reply received by the Office later than three months a ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	MAILING DA s of 37 CFR 1.136 munication. tatutory period will will, by statute, of	TE OF THIS COMMUN 6(a). In no event, however, may I apply and will expire SIX (6) Mo cause the application to become	NICATION. a reply be timely filed ONTHS from the mailing date of this ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status									
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on <i>06 Ma</i>	rch 2006.						
•	•		action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is								
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposit	on of Claims								
4)⊠	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6 and 10</u> is/are pending in the application.								
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
6)⊠)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6 and 10</u> is/are rejected.								
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restrict	ction and/or	election requirement.						
Applicati	on Papers								
9)[The specification is objected to by th	e Examiner.							
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are:	: a) accep	oted or b) objected to	o by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).									
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).									
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to	o by the Exa	miner. Note the attach	ed Office Action or form F	PTO-152.				
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).									
a)	a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:								
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.								
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No								
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage								
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).									
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.									
Attachmen									
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date									
3) 🔯 Infor	e of Dransperson's Patent Drawing Review (F mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or r No(s)/Mail Date <u>8-1005,7-6&6-16-04</u> .		_	f Informal Patent Application (P	TO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/810,774

Art Unit: 3682

Applicant's election without traverse of the bearing invention is acknowledged. Claim(s) is/are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 C.F.R. § 1.142(b), as being drawn to non-elected species, not all claims depending upon or otherwise including the limitations of an allowed generic claim.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim(s) 1-2 and 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being anticipated by Arney et al. '375 ("Arney").

Arney at fig. 12 and paragraph 0052 discloses all of the claimed elements including, for example, the nanostructures near 1108 and 1109 and droplet near 1007a.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a

Application/Control Number: 10/810,774

Art Unit: 3682

person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim(s) 2 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Arney as set forth in the rejection of claim(s) 1-2 and 4-6 above, and further in view of official notice of common knowledge in the art, and/or, in the alternative, engineering design choice.

The examiner finds that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the additional feature(s) in question since it was known in the art to do so to provide the function(s) disclosed.

Alternatively or additionally, the examiner finds that the broad provision of this/these features *vis-à-vis* that/those disclosed by the reference solve(s) no stated problem insofar as the record is concerned and, accordingly, would have been an obvious matter of design choice. See *In re Kuhle*, 526 F.2d 553, 188 USPQ 7 (CCPA 1975).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lenard A. Footland, whose telephone number is (571) 272-7103.

Fax: 703-872-9326

Application/Control Number: 10/810,774

Art Unit: 3682

Lenard A. Footland

Trans A. Frottans

Primary Examiner

Technology Center 3600

Art Unit 3682

laf March 23, 2006